

DAVID SCHER, California Bar No. 184562  
THE EMPLOYMENT LAW GROUP, P.C.  
888 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
[dscher@employmentlawgroup.net](mailto:dscher@employmentlawgroup.net)  
(202) 261-2802  
(202) 261-2835 (facsimile)  
*Counsel for Plaintiff Tim Galli*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

TIM GALLI,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL  
DISTRICT, BARBARA WILSON and  
PERCY MCGEE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:09-cv-03775-JSW

**JOINT STIPULATION ON CASE  
SCHEDULING  
AND ORDER THEREON**

**SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THIS COURT, THE PARTIES HEREBY  
STIPULATE TO THE FOLLOWING:**

1. On October 9, 2009, the parties agreed to stipulate to various matters, including a Case Management Conference on January 8, 2009, telephonically, subject to the Court's approval.
2. On October 10, 2009, the Court Ordered that a Case Management Conference will be held, in person, on January 8, 2009.
3. Plaintiff was unavailable in person on January 8, 2009, the prior date set for the Case Management Conference. The parties agreed, and the Court approved the agreement, to hold the Initial Case Management Conference on January 29, 2010, in person.
4. On December 11, 2009, all parties, through their respective counsel of record,

1 engaged in the Rule 26 conference telephonically to discuss those items required by Rule 26(f)  
2 including initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and a discovery plan for the  
3 above-referenced matter.

4 5. On December 18, 2009, all parties, through their respective counsel of record,  
5 engaged in a follow-up teleconference to further discuss a discovery plan for the above-referenced  
6 matter.

7 6. As part of the outcome of those two teleconferences and follow up correspondence  
8 between the parties' counsel, the parties agreed to submit the instant matter to alternate dispute  
9 resolution (specifically Early Neutral Evaluation ("ENE")) to attempt to resolve the matter, if  
10 possible, in advance of the Case Management Conference.

11 7. Counsel for Defendants determined, through contact with the Court's ENE program,  
12 that, with enough advanced notice, it may be possible to schedule ENE prior to the Case  
13 Management Conference.

14 8. Discovery is ongoing, notwithstanding the delay in the Case Management  
15 Conference.

16 9. Plaintiff has now determined that he has a scheduling conflict with January 29, 2010,  
17 the current date of the Initial Case Management Conference.

18 10. Accordingly, to accommodate Plaintiff's scheduling conflict and to allow for ENE  
19 and potential early resolution if possible, the parties request to extend the Case Management  
20 Conference to Friday, March 26, 2010.

21  
22  
23 **SO STIPULATED.**  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

The Employment Law Group, P.C.  
888 17th Street, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Ph: 202.331.2883 • Fax: 202.261.2835

1 DATED: December 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

2 THE EMPLOYMENT LAW GROUP, P.C.

3  
4 By: /s/  
5 David Scher  
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff TIM GALLI

7 DATED: December 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,


8 FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP

9  
10  
11 By: /s/  
12 Roy A. Combs  
13 Attorneys for Defendants PITTSBURG UNIFIED  
14 SCHOOL DISTRICT, BARBARA WILSON  
15 AND PERCY MCGEE

16  
17  
18 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

19  
20 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, pursuant to the above Stipulation of the parties, that the case  
21 schedule be amended as outlined above. The case management conference is CONTINUED to  
22 March 26, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. A joint case management  
conference statement shall be filed by March 19, 2010.

23 DATED: January 5, 2010

24  
25   
Hon. Jeffrey S. White

26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE